

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The final Office Action of November 28, 2007, and the Decision on Appeal mailed March 29, 2011 have been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-3, 6, and 18 have been amended. Claims 8-11, 12-17 and 19 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-7, 18 and 20 remain pending. Entry of the amendments, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

#### ***Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)***

Claims 1-5 and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,546,405, “Gupta”) in view of Boreczky *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,366,296, “Boreczky”) and Bennett *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,884,256, “Bennett”). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

automatically creating, at the user’s equipment, an annotation file for the multimedia presentation, wherein automatically creating the annotation file includes:

storing a first pointer corresponding to a first desired portion of the plurality of desired portions and a second pointer corresponding to a second desired portion of the plurality of desired portions in the annotation file, wherein the first desired portion and the second desired portion are separated in the multimedia presentation by an intervening portion, and

storing displayable content information describing a non-identified portion of the multimedia presentation; and

presenting only the plurality of desired portions of the multimedia presentation along with the displayable content information stored in the annotation file without presenting any other portion of the multimedia presentation including the intervening portion, wherein the second desired portion is displayed automatically after the first desired portion without user interaction.

Even assuming, without conceding, that Gupta describes the identification of desired portions and creation of an annotation file, there is still no teaching or suggest in any of the cited documents of storing displayable content information describing a ***non-identified portion*** of the multimedia presentation as recited in claim 1. While Gupta describes displaying the annotations specified by the user (See, e.g., Abstract), Gupta does not teach or suggest that such annotations constitute content information describing a ***non-identified portion*** of the multimedia

presentation, much less automatically displaying such information. Even Gupta's description of annotations including personal notes and links to related information at col. 3, ll. 19-23 does not teach or suggest content information describing a non-identified portion of the multimedia portion being marked/annotated. The other cited documents are similarly deficient. Accordingly, notwithstanding whether the asserted combination is valid, the combination would not have resulted in the features recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is thus allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 2-5 are dependent on claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Claims 13-17 were previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering these rejections moot.

Claims 6-9, 12, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta, Boreczky, Bennett and Kelly *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,907,322, "Kelly"). Applicants traverse these rejections.

Claim 6 recites features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1 and is thus allowable over Gupta, Boreczky and Bennett for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Kelly fails to cure the deficiencies of Gupta, Boreczky and Bennett identified above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, claim 6 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claim 7 is dependent on claim 6 and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 6 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Independent claim 18 recites features similar to the above-recited features of claim 6 and is thus allowable for substantially the same reasons as claim 6. Claim 20, which depends on claim 18, is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 18 by virtue of its dependency and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

**CONCLUSION**

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner find that a telephonic or personal interview would expedite passage to issue of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below. If any additional fees are required or if an overpayment has been made the Commissioner is authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 19-0733. Applicants look forward to passage to issue of the present application at the earliest convenience of the Office.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: May 29, 2011

By:           /Chunhsi Andy Mu/          

Chunhsi Andy Mu  
Registration No. 58,216

1100 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051  
Tel:(202) 824-3000  
Fax:(202) 824-3001